## Suicide AC

### ROTB

#### Suicide is a massive social problem in the United States, the mortality figures are worse than war or AIDS and the suffering is tremendous.

Goldsmith et al 02 “Reducing Suicide: A National Imperative” SK Goldsmith, TC Pellmar, AM Kleinman, WE Bunney, Editors, Committee on Pathophysiology & Prevention of Adolescent & Adult Suicide, Board on Neuroscience and Behavioral Health 2002 http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10398.html

**Suicide is** the eleventh leading cause of death for all ages in the United States and **the third leading cause of death among adolescents**. A great deal of local and national funding and effort has been devoted to the problem of homicide in contrast to suicide. However, **suicides** in this country **outnumber homicides by a third. During the period of the Vietnam War, four times the number of Americans died by suicide than** died in **combat**. **Two hundred thousand more people died of suicide than died of AIDS in the past 20 years**. **These** mortality **figures do not capture the intense suffering of the suicidal patient**. One patient stated the night before she committed suicide: “**The pain is all consuming**, overwhelming. The pain has become excruciating, **constant and endless**.”

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that advocates for the best method of gun control to reduce suicide.

#### 1. Suicide causes mass suffering in the United States. According to the CDC, <http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr64/nvsr64_02.pdf> almost twice as many deaths occur due to suicide with a firearm than homicide with a firearm.

#### And, focus on suicide is key because of its historic and current underfunding and apathy. Focus on the issue will also lead to other beneficial medical developments.

Goldsmith 2 “Reducing Suicide: A National Imperative” SK Goldsmith, TC Pellmar, AM Kleinman, WE Bunney, Editors, Committee on Pathophysiology & Prevention of Adolescent & Adult Suicide, Board on Neuroscience and Behavioral Health 2002 http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10398.html

**Suicide represents a major national and international public health problem with** about **30,000 deaths in the United States and 1,000,000 deaths in the world each year** and every year. The **estimated cost** to this nation in lost income alone is **11.8 billion** dollars **per year**. **Ther**e has been in the past and **is** currently **a dramatic mismatch in terms of the federal dollars devoted to the understanding and prevention of suicide contrasted with other diseases** of less public health impact. Research tools and opportunities currently exist to attack the problem of suicide. **Recent successful programs for the prevention of suicide demand further testing**. This report recommends a comprehensive approach to suicide and the development of a network of research laboratories for the study of suicide. There is every reason to expect that a **national consensus** to declare war on suicide and **to fund research and prevention at a level commensurate with the severity of the problem will be successful and will lead to highly significant discoveries as have the wars on cancer**, Alzheimer’s disease, **and AIDS**.

#### 2. Suicide is shrouded in cultural stigma. Massive stigma is placed on suicide in the status quo which prevents individuals from seeking treatment. Open discourse is key to breaking this apart.

Cowan 15 Kristina “Suicide and Its Unrelenting Stigma” January 26th 2015 Huffington Post <http://www.huffingtonpost.com/kristina-cowan/suicide-and-its-unrelenti_b_6543364.html> JW

Suicide is an earthquake. Sudden, jolting and catastrophic, it ruptures the lives of those it leaves behind. The aftershocks ripple into subsequent generations. We spend years navigating our emotional landscapes, seismically realigned by chasms of guilt, confusion and regret. We build bridges when we share our grief, seek individual or group therapy, and work toward healing and growth. Maybe the most ominous ravine is the one filled by stigma. It often seems impossible to cross. Stigma is defined as "a mark of disgrace or infamy; a stain or reproach, as on one's reputation." Our society does a good job of saddling suicide with stigma. In an effort to make sense of it, perhaps, we label the person who ended his or her life. He was selfish. She was crazy. They took the easy way out. These sorts of things couldn't happen to us. Statistics say otherwise. In the United States, someone dies by suicide every 13 minutes, and each death intimately affects at least six others, according to the American Association of Suicidology. Between 1989 and 2013, there were 825,832 suicides, leaving an estimated 4.95 million survivors behind, the AAS says. Until Jim's death, I assumed suicide was reserved for people afflicted by excessive fame, addictions or crimes. Our culture drives these assumptions. Before my brother ended his life, one of the few times suicide came to mind was when I crossed the Golden Gate Bridge, in 2008. I was struck by the prominent signs urging suicidal people to seek help. Last year San Francisco's Golden Gate Bridge Board of Directors unanimously approved funding for a 20-foot-wide steel net -- a so-called suicide barrier, according to CNN. Author Amy Simpson backs this up in her book, Troubled Minds: Mental Illness and the Church's Mission: Have you ever paid attention to the way people with mental illness are portrayed in popular media? While some works, especially more recent ones, treat mental illness with honesty and sensitivity, most of popular media treats the mentally ill as either frightening or funny or both. Most people don't seem to give it a second thought, but for people whose loved ones suffer from ongoing serious mental illness, such portrayals are hard to ignore. The last 16 months have revealed flaws in my thinking. I'm bent on raising awareness about suicide and helping others prevent it. A major hurdle I'm seeing is related to stigma. It chases those who've attempted suicide, those who lose loved ones and even psychiatrists who treat suicidal patients. In a recent conversation with my dad, I was reminded how pervasive stigma is. Jim was from my mom's first marriage, so we have different fathers. My dad was Jim's stepfather, raising him from the age of 4. Their relationship was strained from the start. My dad is the son of Greek immigrants. I never knew my paternal grandparents, but it seems they trained him not to acknowledge his feelings. My dad had a troubled relationship with my grandfather, and he repeated some of it with my brother. Once Jim was an adult, he distanced himself from my dad, but they remained civil. In the early days after Jim died, my dad presented a stoic front. He's suggested that we shouldn't dwell on his death; we must "move on." I was surprised when he admitted to struggling emotionally, grappling with guilt over not being a better father to Jim. His medical doctor has referred him to a therapist. Yet my dad hasn't acknowledged the source of his angst, afraid of what the M.D. might think. Stigma. It plagues those mired by suicidal thoughts and attempts, as Kevin Caruso, founder of Suicide.org, explains on the site: Because of the stigma (the ignorant stigma, mind you) that still exists concerning mental illness, many people who need help do not seek it. Even though there is clear scientific data that indicates irrefutably that a physical connection exists with most mental disorders, many people still stigmatize others because they stupidly hold on to the misguided beliefs of yesteryear that people with mental disorders are weak or just lack will power. Some suicide-attempt survivors are pushing back against stigma they've faced, according to a Chicago Tribune story: "They are speaking up in an effort to educate, raise awareness and reduce stigma about suicide, which advocates say is a public health issue, not a private shame." Psychiatrists who treat suicidal patients face an especially sharp stigma. A story in The Atlantic says: ... the stigma of suicide is so strong that it's often an issue left unspoken, even by doctors. Many psychiatrists refuse to treat chronically suicidal patients, not only because of the stigma that surrounds it even in their profession, but because suicide is the number-one cause of lawsuits brought against mental-health treatment providers. My dad's hunch is right, sadly. Even the medical field is beset by stigma. That's hard to grasp, because mental health practitioners are supposed to be a place of refuge for those battling suicidal thoughts. It sometimes infects another safe haven, too -- churches. In her book, Simpson explains in a chapter on stigma: Although 80 percent of church leaders said they believe mental illness is 'a real, treatable and manageable illness caused by genetic, biological or environmental factors,' only 12. 5 percent of them said mental illness is openly discussed in a healthy way in their church. Exploring drivers of the stigma, she writes: Some churches stigmatize mental illness because they simply don't want 'the wrong kind of people' interfering with their vision for their churches ... Let's face it: a thriving ministry to people with mental illness is not the easiest or most ego-polishing kind of ministry. No one, no institution or part of our society, is free from stigma associated with suicide and mental illness. Changing this will be an enormous endeavor. What will it require? Raising our voices individually and collectively, as some attempt survivors have. Working with our mental-health providers and places of worship, to quell fears of lawsuits and unfavorable public opinion. Examining our own misconceptions, and striving for greater sensitivity. And that's just a short list. We must press on, in honor of those we've lost, for attempt survivors, for grieving families, and for our friends and family of the future, who one day will face atrocious battles against mental illness and suicidal thoughts.

#### This outweighs other offense-there is a unique cultural stigma that surrounds suicide and we need to take positive steps in forwarding discussion.

#### And, I’m the only one with any shred of an out of round impact-discourse about suicide is key to preventing it.

An anonymous mental health facility director in 2015 ("Megsanity" is the alias of a licensed clinical therapist who has spent the majority of the last ten years working as the Clinical Director/Vice President of Clinical Operations for a JCAHO accredited mental health facility. She needed an anonymous outlet where it was acceptable to drop the F-bomb like it's hot. She has experience in private clinical practice as well as community-based mental health agencies, schools and the veteran's administration) “Do We Need To Worry About Suicide Contagion” September 9th 2015 http://megsanity.com/article.asp?post=226 JW

But those people who are vulnerable to suicide contagion are already considering it. This isn't like some happy-go-lucky softmore is suddenly going to want to die just because her favorite comic did. By avoiding discussions of suicide, we push it into a closet. We tell people thinking those thoughts, “We do not accept you, this isn’t normal, this isn’t okay,” instead of “We understand, let us help.” We force people to suffer alone, in silence, and are inexplicably shocked when someone ends their own life. Suicide isn't what kills people. It is the depression, the deep feelings of being misunderstood and helpless, the isolation that propels one down that path. Suicide is the end result, but not the ultimate cause of death. And by avoiding these discussions, we also ensure that the people who might have been able to help don't know what signs to look for in someone who is depressed or considering suicide. As a society, we are stuck between a rock and a hard place, where the shame and judgment and fear that one death will trigger another sometimes outweighs the desire to clarify what occurred. We are left to repeat the cycle for eternity, sweeping suicide under the rug, never to discuss it again.

#### 3. Psychoanalysis: accepting death leads to insular communal behavior and racism.

Pyszczynski 4 Tom, Prof. Psych. – U. Colorado, Social Research, “What are we so afraid of? A terror management theory perspective on the politics of fear”, Winter, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2267/is\_4\_71/ai\_n13807478/

One thing that has become very clear from our studies of the effects of thinking about death is that the problem of death affects us in very different ways, depending on whether we are consciously thinking of it or whether it is on the fringes of consciousness--what cognitive psychologists would refer to as highly accessible but outside of current focal attention (Pyszczynski, Greenberg, and Solomon, 1999). The clinging to the worldview and pursuit of self-esteem that the studies described earlier document occur when thoughts of death are on the fringes of consciousness--shortly after being reminded of the problem of death and after a distraction; or when death-related words or symbols are presented subliminally, so that people are not aware of them. What is interesting and important to realize about the pursuit of self-esteem and faith in our worldviews is that these defenses bear no logical or semantic relation to the problem of death--what does being a good American have to do with the fact that I am going to die someday? In a logical sense, absolutely nothing, but we are socialized early in life to use meaning and self-esteem as ways of protecting ourselves from our fears and anxieties. On the other hand, when people are consciously thinking about death, they cope in very different ways that do have a logical connection to death. These defenses seem to make sense. We either distract ourselves from the problem of death, by switching the topic or turning up the radio as we drive by an accident scene, or try to convince ourselves that death is a problem for the distant future. We remind ourselves that our grandmother lived to be 99, that we do not smoke, or we promise to get more exercise, start taking that medicine our doctor has been pushing, or get on the latest fad diet. The point here is that because it is highly accessible but unconscious thoughts of death that promote clinging to our worldviews or self-esteem, it is difficult if not impossible to observe this in ourselves. But the empirical evidence is really very clear now. So let us turn to a consideration of how this core human fear of death affects us in ways that politicians and other leaders can manipulate. DEATH AND NATIONALISM One of our earliest and most widely replicated findings is that reminders of death increase nationalism and other forms of group identification, making people more accepting of those who are similar to themselves and more hostile toward those who are different. For example, in a very early study we found that reminding people of death led them to react more positively toward a person who praised America and more negatively toward a person who criticized America (Greenberg et al., 1990). Similar patterns have been found all over the world. When subtly reminded of death, Germans sit closer to fellow Germans and farther away from Turks (Ochsman and Mathay, 1994) and, more recently, show an increased preference for the deutsche mark over the euro (Jonas and Greenberg, in press); Dutch citizens exaggerate how badly the Dutch national soccer team will beat the rival German team (Dechesne et al., 2000); Israelis are more accepting of fellow Israelis and rejecting of Russian Jews who have immigrated to Israel (Florian and Mikulincer, 1998); Italians view Italian identity as more "real," reflecting bigger differences between Italians and people from other countries (Castano et al., 2002); and Scots are more discriminating in judging pictures as either Scottish or English, viewing fewer faces of Englishmen as Scottish (Castano, Yzerbet, and Palladino, 2004). These findings all come from highly controlled laboratory experiments.

#### Impacts:

#### A) debate should be a space designed to encourage debaters to reject representations of death-the alternative is oppression and straying away from discussing social issues.

#### B) prefer psychoanalysis to all other role of the ballot warrants- it’s a form of empirical analysis that tests what the best model for argumentation is-all your claims are purely hypothetical. Neg roles of the ballot must have empirical evidence about how certain arguments encourage and discourage discussion or else their framework fails to be a good model for debate.

### Contention

#### I will defend implementation of the entire resolution but specify further in cross-ex if you want.

#### Empirical consensus shows that handgun ownership increases risk of suicide.

Miller et al 13 Matthew Miller (Department of Health Policy and Management, Harvard School of Public Health), Catherine Barber, Richard A. White, and Deborah Azrael “Firearms and Suicide in the United States: Is Risk Independent of Underlying Suicidal Behavior?” American Journal of Epidemiology Vol. 178, No. 6 August 23, 2013 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23975641> JW

On an average day in the United States, more than 100 Americans die by suicide; half of these suicides involve the use of firearms (1). Suicide rates, both overall and by firearms, are higher, in general, in places where household firearm ownership is more common. By contrast, rates of suicide by methods other than firearms are not significantly correlated with rates of household firearm ownership (2, 3). This pattern of higher suicide rates in places where firearms are more readily available, driven by higher firearm suicide rates, has been reported in ecological studies that have adjusted for several potential confounders, including aggregate measures of psychological distress, degree of urbanization, alcohol and illicit drug use and abuse, poverty, education, and unemployment (2–6). Household firearm ownership has also consistently been found to be a strong predictor of suicide risk in studies that use individual level data. Every US case-control study, for example, has found that the presence of a gun in the home is a risk factor for suicide (7–20). In addition, the only large US cohort study to examine the firearm-suicide connection found that suicide rates among California residents who purchased handguns from licensed dealers were more than twice as likely to die by suicide as were age- and sex-matched members of the general population, not only immediately after the purchase, but throughout the 6-year study period (21). Here too, the increase in suicide risk was attributable entirely to an excess risk of suicide with firearms (21). The following observations further support the plausibility that the association between firearms and suicide is real: 1) the association is robust to adjustment for measures of psychopathology (7–16), 2) the risk extends beyond the gun owner to all household members (14, 15, 21) and persists for years after firearms are purchased (14, 15, 21), 3) the rates of psychiatric illness and psychosocial distress are similar among households with firearms versus those without firearms (15, 22–25), and 4) ecological studies of the firearm-suicide relationship, which are not subject to recall bias or to reverse causation, yield associations similar to those observed in individual-level studies. Nevertheless, the idea that the availability of firearms plays an important role in determining a person’s suicide risk and a population’s suicide rate continues to meet with skepticism, the most decisive objection being that empirical studies to date have not adequately controlled for the possibility that members of households with firearms are inherently more suicidal than members of households without firearms (26).

#### Reducing the presence of firearms causes large reductions in suicide.

Miller et al 13 Matthew Miller (Department of Health Policy and Management, Harvard School of Public Health), Catherine Barber, Richard A. White, and Deborah Azrael “Firearms and Suicide in the United States: Is Risk Independent of Underlying Suicidal Behavior?” American Journal of Epidemiology Vol. 178, No. 6 August 23, 2013 <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23975641> JW

In the United States, where firearms are the method used in more than 50% of all suicides and where roughly 1 in 3 homes contains firearms, even small relative declines in the use of firearms in suicide acts could result in large reductions in the number of suicides, depending on what, if any, method would be substituted for firearms. Consider, for example, the fact that more than 90% of all suicidal acts with firearms are fatal, but suicidal acts with firearms constitute only 5% of all deliberate self-harm episodes. In contrast, fewer than 3% of all suicidal acts with drugs or cutting are fatal but, as a group, such acts constitute approximately 90% of all attempts (33, 34). If even 1 in 10 of the approximately 22,000 persons who attempted suicide with firearms in 2010 (the 19,932 who died and the approximately 2,000 who survived) substituted drugs or cutting, there would have been approximately 1,900 fewer suicide deaths. The potential for substantial reduction in suicide rates is apparent in our comparison of suicides in high– versus low–gun ownership states, where suicide attempt rates are similar, but the rate of suicide is twice as high in high– gun ownership states (with differences in mortality attributable entirely to differences in suicide by firearms), with a net excess of approximately 6,000 suicides in high–gun ownership states over a 2-year period.

#### Banning handguns solves—removes the root cause of gun ownership.

Dixon 93 Nicholas (Associate Professor of Philosophy, Alma College) “WHY WE SHOULD BAN HANDGUNS IN THE UNITED STATES” 12 St. Louis U. Pub. L. Rev. 243 1993 JW

I am assuming that the number of handguns in a country depends on (1) the permissiveness of its handgun laws, and (2) the demand for handguns. Handgun laws in the United States are far more permissive than in any of the comparison countries.' Since the law is much more easily controlled than the people's wishes, by far the easiest way to reduce handgun ownership is to pass more restrictive laws. My proposal, then, is that the best way to reduce handgun homicides is to pass maximally restrictive laws - a handgun ban. Two interesting points concerning the demand for handguns are worth noting. First, it is probable that, doubtless due in part to the long history of private gun ownership in this country, there is more demand for them in the United States than in the other countries.' In order to achieve the same levels of gun ownership in the United States as in other countries, therefore, it is likely that even more restrictive handgun laws will be required. Second, a reduction in the number of handguns in this country (by means of a handgun ban) can reasonably be expected to result in a reduction in demand, which will in turn cause a further reduction in ownership levels. This result is because a major reason for handgun ownership at present is to defend oneself against the huge number of people who already have handguns. (See infra section II.E for a discussion of the defensive efficacy of handguns.) I propose stemming this spiral of gun ownership at its source rather than simply acquiescing in the unlimited proliferation of handguns.

#### Suicide is often compulsive and non-autonomous—gun control is key.

DeGrazia 14 David (Professor of Philosophy at George Washington University) “The Case for Moderate Gun Control” Kennedy Institute of Ethics Journal Vol. 24, No. 1, 1–25 2014 JW

First, even if we acknowledge a right to commit suicide, from any reasonable perspective the vast majority of suicides must be regarded as tragic. It is not very often that we carefully reflect upon the circumstances of someone who committed a suicide and think, “Yes, suicide was the very best option for that individual.” Sometimes we may, but not very often—especially when the victim of suicide is a child, a mentally ill person, or someone who acts impulsively. Often those who commit [die by] suicide are unaware of, or are momentarily unable to appreciate, the prospects for their lives going better. In a very real sense, then, many people who feel a desire to commit suicide do need protection against themselves. Relatedly, if there is a right to commit suicide, it is plausibly limited to suicidal choices that are genuinely autonomous—choices, that is, that are carried out voluntarily (not primarily driven by external pressures or internal compulsions) with an adequate understanding of one’s realistic options (including those involving available forms of help), and with the psychological capacity to appreciate those options (as opposed to devaluing them due to the distorting effects of depression). An autonomous choice will accord with one’s values and stable preferences. Some suicides committed with the help of a physician meet these criteria; no doubt some suicides committed without such help do as well. But, of course, one doesn’t need a gun to commit suicide autonomously. And the presence of guns makes it more likely that one will kill oneself impulsively and non-autonomously. Thus, a right to commit suicide, plausibly construed, will not undermine the thesis that gun ownership for the purpose of self-defense is, on average, self-defeating.

#### *Death is intrinsically bad—it ontologically destroys the source of value.*

*Paterson 03 Craig (Department of Philosophy, Providence College) “A Life Not Worth Living?” Studies in Christian Ethics 2003*

*Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81 In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82*

#### Suicide among young black men is increasing at an alarming rate.

Goldsmith 3 “Reducing Suicide: A National Imperative” SK Goldsmith, TC Pellmar, AM Kleinman, WE Bunney, Editors, Committee on Pathophysiology & Prevention of Adolescent & Adult Suicide, Board on Neuroscience and Behavioral Health 2002 http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10398.html

The rate of suicide among African Americans has historically been lower than that of whites, but in young black males the gap has been gradually closing (see Table 2-2; Griffith and Bell, 1989). In fact, the rate of increase in young black males has been a cause for concern. From 1980 to 1995, the suicide rates for black youth ages 10–19 increased from 2.1 to 4.5 per 100,000—an increase of 114 percent. For comparison over the same time, the rates in white males of the same ages increased from 5.4 to 6.4 per 100,000. The suicide rate increased the most for blacks ages 10–14 years (233 percent; CDC, 1998). The convergence of black and white rates was more dramatic with different age groups. For example in 1986 in black men 25–34 the rate (20/100,000) was nearly the same as in the same aged white male (26/100,000) (Griffith and Bell, 1989; Hollinger et al., 1994). In 1993 for ages 25–34 the suicide rates for white men was 25.6/ 100,000 and for black men was 24.0/100,000.

#### Oppression is created by social systems so only a focus on material conditions can solve.

Johnson no date Allan Johnson (PhD in sociology, he joined the sociology department at Wesleyan University) <http://www.cabrillo.edu/~lroberts/AlanJohnsonWhatCanWeDO001.pdf> JW

Privilege is a feature of social systems, not individuals. People have or don't have privilege depending on the system they're in and the social categories other people put them in. To say, then, that I have race privilege says less about me personally than it does about the society we all live in and how it is organized to assign privilege on the basis of a socially defined set of racial categories that change historically and often overlap. The challenge facing me as an individual has more to do with how I participate in society as a recipient of race privilege and how those choices oppose or support the system itself. In dealing with the problem of privilege, we have to get used to being surrounded by paradox. Very often those who have privilege don't know it, for example, which is a key aspect of privilege. Also paradoxical is the fact that privilege doesn't necessarily lead to a "good life," which can prompt people in privileged groups to deny resentfully that they even have it. But privilege doesn't equate with being happy. It involves having what others don't have and the struggle to hang on to it at their expense, neither of which is a recipe for joy, personal fulfillment, or spiritual contentment.... To be an effective part of the solution, we have to realize that privilege and oppression are not a thing of the past. It's [is] happening right now. It isn't just a collection of wounds inflicted long ago that now need to be healed. The wounding goes on as I write these words and as you read them, and unless people work to change the system that promotes it, personal healing by itself cannot be the answer. Healing wounds is no more a solution to the oppression that causes the wounding than military hospitals are a solution to war. Healing is a necessary process, but it isn't enough.... Since privilege is rooted primarily in systems—such as families, schools, and workplaces—change isn't simply a matter of changing people. People, of course, will have to change in order for systems to change, but the most important point is that changing people isn't enough. The solution also has to include entire systems, such as capitalism, whose paths of least resistance shape how we feel, think, and behave as individuals, how we see ourselves and one another.

#### Solutions to critical issues must be discussed through pragmatic approaches within hegemonic power structures.

Kapoor 8, 2008 (Ilan, Associate Professor at the Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University, “The Postcolonial Politics of Development,” p. 138-139)

There are perhaps several other social movement campaigns that could be cited as examples of a ‘hybridizing strategy’.5 But what emerges as important from the Chipko and NBA campaigns is the way in which they treat laws and policies, institutional practices, and ideological apparatuses as deconstructible. That is, they refuse to take dominant authority at face value, and proceed to reveal its contingencies. Sometimes, they expose what the hegemon is trying to disavow or hide (exclusion of affected communities in project design and implementation, faulty information gathering and dissemination). Sometimes, they problematize dominant or naturalized truths (‘development = unlimited economic growth = capitalism’, ‘big is better’, ‘technology can save the environment’). In either case, by contesting, publicizing, and politicizing accepted or hidden truths, they hybridize power, challenging its smugness and triumphalism, revealing its impurities. They show power to be, literally and figuratively, a bastard. While speaking truth to power, a hybridizing strategy also [it] exploits the instabilities of power. In part, this involves showing up and taking advantage of the equivocations of power — conflicting laws, contradictory policies, unfulfilled promises. A lot has to do here with publicly shaming the hegemon, forcing it to remedy injustices and live up to stated commitments in a more accountable and transparent manner. And, in part, this involves nurturing or manipulating the splits and strains within institutions. Such maneuvering can take the form of cultivating allies, forging alliances, or throwing doubt on prevailing orthodoxy. Note, lastly, the way in which a hybridizing strategy works with the dominant discourse. This reflects the negotiative aspect of Bhabha’s performativity. The strategy may outwit the hegemon, but it does so from the interstices of the hegemony. The master may be paralyzed, but his paralysis is induced using his own poison/medicine. It is for this reason that cultivating allies in the adversarial camp is possible: when you speak their language and appeal to their own ethical horizons, you are building a modicum of common ground. It is for this reason also that the master cannot easily dismiss or crush you. Observing his rules and playing [their] his game makes it difficult for him not to take you seriously or grant you a certain legitimacy. The use of non-violent tactics may be crucial in this regard: state repression is easily justified against violent adversaries, but it is vulnerable to public criticism when used against non-violence. Thus, the fact that Chipko and the NBA deployed civil disobedience — pioneered, it must be pointed out, by the ‘father of the nation’ (i.e. Gandhi) — made it difficult for the state to quash them or deflect their claims.

#### Critique is useless without a concrete policy option that solves for the harms you discuss.

Bryant 12 Levi Bryant (Professor of Philosophy at Collin College) “A Critique of the Academic Left” 2012 <https://larvalsubjects.wordpress.com/2012/11/11/underpants-gnomes-a-critique-of-the-academic-left/> JW

Unfortunately, the academic left falls prey to its own form of abstraction. It’s good at carrying out critiques that denounce various social formations, yet very poor at proposing any sort of realistic constructions of alternatives. This because it thinks abstractly in its own way, ignor[es]ing how networks, assemblages, structures, or regimes of attraction would have to be remade to create a workable alternative. Here I’m reminded by the “underpants gnomes” depicted in South Park: The underpants gnomes have a plan for achieving profit that goes like this: Phase 1: Collect Underpants Phase 2: ? Phase 3: Profit! They even have a catchy song to go with their work: Well this is sadly how it often is with the academic left. Our plan seems to be as follows: Phase 1: Ultra-Radical Critique Phase 2: ? Phase 3: Revolution and complete social transformation! Our problem is that we seem perpetually stuck at phase 1 without ever explaining what is to be done at phase 2. Often the critiques articulated at phase 1 are right, but there are nonetheless all sorts of problems with those critiques nonetheless. In order to reach phase 3, we have to produce new collectives. In order for new collectives to be produced, people need to be able to hear and understand the critiques developed at phase 1. Yet this is where everything begins to fall apart. Even though these critiques are often right, we express [critiques] them in ways that only an academic with a PhD in critical theory and post-structural theory can understand. How exactly is Adorno to produce an effect in the world if only PhD’s in the humanities can understand him? Who are these things for? We seem to always ignore these things and then look down our noses with disdain at the Naomi Kleins and David Graebers of the world. To make matters worse, we publish our work in expensive academic journals that only universities can afford, with presses that don’t have a wide distribution, and give our talks at expensive hotels at academic conferences attended only by other academics. Again, who are these things for? Is it an accident that so many activists look away from these things with contempt, thinking their more about an academic industry and tenure, than producing change in the world? If a tree falls in a forest and no one is there to hear it, it doesn’t make a sound! Seriously dudes and dudettes, what are you doing? But finally, and worst of all, us Marxists and anarchists all too often act like assholes. We denounce others, we condemn them, we berate them for not engaging with the questions we want to engage with, and we vilify them when they don’t embrace every bit of the doxa that we endorse. We are every bit as off-putting and unpleasant as the fundamentalist minister or the priest of the inquisition (have people yet understood that Deleuze and Guattari’s Anti-Oedipus was a critique of the French communist party system and the Stalinist party system, and the horrific passions that arise out of parties and identifications in general?). This type of “revolutionary” is the greatest friend of the reactionary and capitalist because they do more to drive people into the embrace of reigning ideology than to undermine reigning ideology. These are the people that keep Rush Limbaugh in business. Well done! But this isn’t where our most serious shortcomings lie. Our most serious shortcomings are to be found at phase 2. We almost never make concrete proposals for how things ought to be restructured, for what new material infrastructures and semiotic fields need to be produced, and when we do, our critique-intoxicated cynics and skeptics immediately jump in with an analysis of all the ways in which these things contain dirty secrets, ugly motives, and are doomed to fail. How, I wonder, are we to do anything at all when we have no concrete proposals? We live on a planet of 6 billion people. These 6 billion people are dependent on a certain network of production and distribution to meet the needs of their consumption. That network of production and distribution does involve the extraction of resources, the production of food, the maintenance of paths of transit and communication, the disposal of waste, the building of shelters, the distribution of medicines, etc., etc., etc.

### Underview:

#### 1. neg abuse outweighs aff abuse. Neg is reactive and can always pick a strat to adapt to the aff and have a good shot at winning the round, 6 minute 2NR means you can answer the 1AR’s drops or coverage issues.

#### 2. aff gets RVIs on counter interps to theory: A) timeskew- 6 minute 2NR means the neg can always cover substance and theory, forcing the 2AR to go for both, kills fairness since I can’t split my time. B) reciprocity- neg gets T and theory, I should get theory and counter interps to theory to keep the theoretical layer 1:1.

# Frontlines

### A2 Antiblackness

#### 1. Indicates the paradigm of policing is racist-not the particular application of it. Police will always look for a way to incarcerate black people because of racism. It doesn’t matter if it’s through drugs, handgun bans, or the mess of gun control laws that exist in the status. Your link is non-unique since the system is already screwed up.

#### 2. The aff is a positive action that helps the black community massively-that’s Goldsmith 3. Suicide rates are increasing in the black community and the aff prevents this by removing access to a large cause-that’s Miller et al 13.

#### 3. Negative attitudes and social stigma are especially prevalent in the black community – the problem is pervasive and probably worse than we think. ALL of my role of the ballot arguments were supercharged.

Goldsmith 02 “Reducing Suicide: A National Imperative” SK Goldsmith, TC Pellmar, AM Kleinman, WE Bunney, Editors, Committee on Pathophysiology & Prevention of Adolescent & Adult Suicide, Board on Neuroscience and Behavioral Health 2002 http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10398.html

The impact of these findings on suicide is difficult to discern, especially in light of the findings of the NMHA (2000) survey on attitudes and beliefs about depression in the African-American community. This survey revealed that the majority think depression is a “personal weakness” and only a third (compared to 69% of the general population) recognize depression as a “health problem” for which they would be willing to take prescribed medication. For further discussion of these issues, see Chapter 6, and the sections in Chapter 7 on faith-based interventions, and Chapter 9 on barriers to treatment.

#### 4. Turn-gun control is a key method to reject oppression.

Younge 15 Gary “Charleston church shooting: Without gun control, racism will keep killing black people” The Guardian June 18th 2015 <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2015/jun/18/charleston-church-shooting-gun-control-racism-killing-black-people-us> JW

Mass shootings have become a banal fact of death in America. (Last year there were 283 incidents in which four or more people were shot.) The nation as a whole, meanwhile, has become newly sensitised to racial violence, with growing activism around police shootings. In April video of a white policeman shooting Walter Scott – an unarmed African American – eight times in the back in as he ran away in North Charleston, South Carolina, went viral. But the shooting of nine black church-goers in Charleston (not far from where Scott was killed) by a white gunman in what police are treating as a “hate crime” marks a doubling down on the nation’s twin pathologies of racism and guns. Both are deeply rooted in the nation’s history since its founding: neither are going anywhere soon. The timing of this particular tragedy, given the heightened consciousness and activism around the #BlackLivesMatter movement, provides a particular lens through which to view this massacre. When Barack Obama won the South Carolina primary in 2008 a huge multiracial crowd gathered in the state capitol of Columbia and chanted “race doesn’t matter”. With each new well-publicised account of racial violence, be it at the hands of the state or the public, claims that the arrival of a black president signals the arrival of a post-racial era collapses under the weight of its own delusion. Racism isn’t dead. We know this because it keeps killing black people. The fact that Clementa Pinckney, a state senator, was among the dead indicates that nobody is safe. The fact that it took place in a church during a prayer meeting indicates that nowhere is safe. America does not have a monopoly on racism. But what makes its racism so lethal is the ease with which people can acquire guns. While the new conversation around race will mean the political response to the fact of this attack will be different, the stale conversation around gun control means the legislative response to the nature of this attack will remain the same. Nothing will happen. After Adam Lanza shot 20 primary school children and six adults in Sandy Hook, Connecticut, in 2012 before turning his gun on himself, nothing happened. Seven children and teens are shot dead every day in America and nothing happens. So these nine victims will join those who perished before them – a sacrifice to the blood-soaked pedestal erected around the constitution’s second amendment that gun lobbyists say guarantees the right of individuals to bear arms. Where guns are concerned this is what passes for American exceptionalism – an 18th century compromise with fatal 21st century ramifications. For the parishioners of the Emanuel African Methodist Episcopal Church in Charleston nothing will ever be the same again. And for those who have the power to prevent it happening again, nothing will change.

## 1AR

### A2 Method Substitution

#### No method substitution.

Goldsmith 2 “Reducing Suicide: A National Imperative” SK Goldsmith, TC Pellmar, AM Kleinman, WE Bunney, Editors, Committee on Pathophysiology & Prevention of Adolescent & Adult Suicide, Board on Neuroscience and Behavioral Health 2002 http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10398.html

**Reducing the availability or the lethality of a method** (**such a**s using blister packs for pills or **enacting stricter gun control laws**) **results in a decline in suicide by that method; method substitution does not invariably occur**. Education of the media regarding appropriate reporting of suicides can limit imitation effects and thereby reduce suicide rates.

### Natives

#### Native American suicide is a huge problem – occurring at a rate nearly double of the general population.

Goldsmith 02 “Reducing Suicide: A National Imperative” SK Goldsmith, TC Pellmar, AM Kleinman, WE Bunney, Editors, Committee on Pathophysiology & Prevention of Adolescent & Adult Suicide, Board on Neuroscience and Behavioral Health 2002 http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10398.html

The rate of suicide among Indians and Alaska Natives of the United States is about 1.7 times the rate of the nation as a whole (Indian Health Service, 1999). Between 1975 and 1977 the rates peaked at 22.5/100,000 and decreased to a low of 16.0 in 1984 through 1986. Since then it increased to its current rate of 19.3 per 100,000 in 1995 (Indian Health Service, 1999). In contrast, over the past 40 years, rates of violence have generally declined for American Indians (Hisnanick, 1994). Suicide takes a significant toll.

#### Historical discrimination and pressure associated with identifying with native culture are drivers for this particularly high rate of suicide.

Goldsmith 2 “Reducing Suicide: A National Imperative” SK Goldsmith, TC Pellmar, AM Kleinman, WE Bunney, Editors, Committee on Pathophysiology & Prevention of Adolescent & Adult Suicide, Board on Neuroscience and Behavioral Health 2002 http://www.nap.edu/catalog/10398.html

Social and familial disruption, cultural conflict, and social disorganization are often cited as major influences on American Indian suicide rates. Suicide rates among American Indians vary with the degree of social and cultural change and acculturation pressure (Garro, 1988; Levy, 1965; VanWinkle and May, 1986; 1993). The high suicide rates among youth in Indian families and communities have been attributed to acute acculturation stress (Levy, 1965; May and Dizmang, 1974; Spaulding, 1985–1986; Travis, 1984; VanWinkle and May, 1986; 1993), cultural conflict (Kahn, 1982; Kettl and Bixler, 1991; Opler, 1969; Patterson, 1969) and social disorganization (EchoHawk, 1997; Expert Working Group, 1994; Joe, 2001; Resnik and Dizmang, 1971). While American Indian and Alaska Native adolescents face the same turmoil as mainstream youth, they are also challenged by self-identity and actualization in their minority status and complex choices as to whether to adhere to mainstream or traditional, native culture (Bechtold, 1994; Howard-Pitney et al., 1992; Sack et al., 1994; U.S. Congress, 1990). The stress of these dilemmas can increase the risk of alcohol or drug abuse, depression or other psychopathology, and parasuicidal and suicidal behavior (Beauvais, 1998; Elliot et al., 1990; Kettl and Bixler, 1993; Manson et al., 1989; May, 1982; Norton et al., 1995; Prince, 1988; Sack et al., 1994).

#### Native American focus is uniquely key. We have a responsibility to become active parts of the solution to the cultural genocide; we have contributed to the problem.

Churchill ‘3 (Ward, Professor of American Indian Studies at University Colorado - Boulder. 2003, (On the Justice of Roosting Chic kens - Reflections on the Consequences of U.S. Imperial Arrogance .and Criminality, pp. 79-83)

In light of the above, **Americans are clearly faced with a choice. On the one hand, they can continue in their collective pretense that "the opposite of everything is true," prattling on about "innocent Americans" being "the most peaceful people on earth" while endorsing the continuous U.S. dispensation of death, destruction and domination in every quarter of the globe. On the other, they must at last commence the process of facing up both to the realities of their national history and to the responsibilities that history has bequeathed.** In effect, **Americans will either become active parts of the solution to what they and their country have wrought, or they will remain equally active parts of the problem. There is no third option**, imagining the contrary, that certain "complexities" create "unique circumstances" in the U.S., circumstances that preclude doing what would be obviously necessaiy and appropriate in any other context ("out there" in the Third World, for instance), is simply to embrace an especially insidious variant of American Exceptionalism, remaining part of the problem rather than acting as part of the solution while pretending that the opposite of that, too, is true. **There is no place for either spectators or bystanders at a holocaust.** Here, the mere "bearing of moral witness" is irrelevant or worse, as is the expression of "opposition" through modes deemed acceptable by the perpetrating entity." Only the undertaking of whatever course of action proves necessary to actually halt the genocidal process-action that can by definition be sanctioned by neither the perpetrators nor those complicit in the perpetration by virtue-of their acquiescence or the "principled" in effectuality of their opposition to it- is acceptable in any defensible moral schema (no, the Jews who in 1944 overpowered and killed a few of the SS men at Auschwitz had not in the process become "just as bad" as their nazi exterminators).32 The only relevant question is thus which among a range of possible courses of action is most likely to obtain the desired outcome, not whether undertaking it will allow those who do so to remain comfortable (much less pure, in some idealized sense). Admittedly, even this singular query can be- indeed, has been- used as a means by which to block action through endlessly digressive speculation. Fortunately, things are not really so nebulous or subjective as those whose oppositional politics amount more to a fashion statement than substance would have it. History does offer a lens, embodied in Germany's experience during the Third Reich, of what is required to nullify the genocidally militaristic posture of a major state. This did not, and could not, come about through a "reform." no matter how "fundamental." of the perpetrating entity. Rather, the desired result was obtained, as it had to be. through outright destruction of the state apparatus itself." True in the case of nazi Germany, it was necessary that this be accomplished by a saturation bombing campaign followed by a massive invasion and occupation of the country by other countries, a procedure that left not only Gennany but most of Europe devastated and some forty million people dead. As was noted even at the time, however, both the fact and the nature of the cataclysm resulted primarily from a default on the part of the German people themselves to shoulder the burden of abolishing the nazi regime. Such an undertaking would not have been painless for the Germans, of course. On the contrary, given the inherently brutal nature of nazism. any effective effort to repeal it would necessarily have been quite violent. But, and this is really the point, the level of violence involved, and the consequent degree of pain suffered by the Germans-not to mention eveiybody else-would have been far less had they simply done what was so obviously necessary in the first place." That the Germans did not rise to the occasion, saving themselves and others untold misery, was the result neither of apathy nor of cowardice. Rather, their collective failure to meet even the most rudimentary of their obligations to humanity accrued from the fact that they, afflicted with their own Teutonic version of America's triumphant exceptionalism. overwhelmingly applauded nazism's imposition of a "new order" both at home and abroad, turning at best a blind eve to its "flaws" until Germany began to incur its first Significant defeats during the winter of 1941-42 (for most Germans, the "turning point in morale") did not really set in until the disaster at Stalingrad a year afterwards, and for many later still. "There after, they were reduced first to fighting with increasing desperation to stave off a collective punishment they knew full well the lethal arrogance of their own behavior had earned them, then by-and-large- in a striking parallel to Americans' perpetually sweeping assertions of "national innocence"- to denying that the punishment was warranted. Those today who are serious in seeking to come to grips with U.S. militarism would do well to heed the lessons provided by the experience of their German predecessors. Leashing the North American Reich will not be attained through petition campaigns, candle-lit vigils, marches, rallies, mass demonstrations or any other such state-sanctioned method of "swaying" policy formation/implementation. It will not be attained through electoral efforts to "throw the bums out" of office or in support of "the lesser of two evils" (the result of which is always and by definition an endorsement of evil), by litigation in judicial fora integral to the offending entity, or by lobbying for the enactment of new laws. Still less will it come through the writing of better books, poems and movie scripts, taking the right drugs, alterations in diet and hair styles, fetishizing the significance of gender parity, establishing alternative radio stations, ridding society of ashtrays or riding bicycles rather than driving cars. With all due respect to Pete Townsend, music is not "the revolution."39 If any or all of these "lines of action" combined were in the least threatening to the stability of the status quo, they'd simply be declared illegal on their face, or, as has often happened, militarily- repressed long before they reach the point of inflicting discemable damage." Each, or at least most, of these approaches yield a discemable utility, but only when their functional limits are properly understood: petition drives and electoral campaigns, litigation and mass protests are of value only to the extent that their organizers consciously employ them as vehicles upon which to demonstrate the impossibility of achieving meaningful change through such means." In the sense, and this sense only, involvement in state-sanctioned modes of political activity can be useful, not as "solutions" or ends in themselves, but as tactical expedients necessary to developing the "critical mass" necessary to eradicate the U.S. **The objective, attainable if approached correctly** (which means, first and foremost, framing issues clearly)**, is to facilitate a popular reappraisal of the "American character." engendering thereby a generalized assessment moving ever closer to a genuine apprehension of reality. Concomitantly, a revision in the self-concept held by individuals, most pronouncedly among those situated within communities of color and elsewhere along the lower third of the socioeconomic spectrum, stands to be set in motion. This, in turn, will all but inevitably precipitate a profound reconceptualization of what must be done if "things are to be set right" in the U.S.. as well as the obligation of "average Americans" to do it. A dynamic duality is thus unleashed, signaled in the first instance by a mounting refusal to serve in the military and other enforcement mechanisms by which the present order is sustained." in the second by a growing willingness to confront and defeat these steadily-weakening institutions on their own terms, ultimately overpowering and discarding them.**

## Role of the Ballot

### Policymaking

#### The state is inevitable—learning to speak the language of power creates the only possibility of social change debate can offer. This is best served by debating the imagined consequences of policy actions.

Coverstone 5 Alan Coverstone (masters in communication from Wake Forest, longtime debate coach) “Acting on Activism: Realizing the Vision of Debate with Pro-social Impact” Paper presented at the National Communication Association Annual Conference November 17th 2005 JW 11/18/15

An important concern emerges when Mitchell describes reflexive fiat as a contest strategy capable of “eschewing the power to directly control external actors” (1998b, p. 20). Describing debates about what our government should do as attempts to control outside actors is debilitating and disempowering. Control of the US government is exactly what an active, participatory citizenry is supposed to be all about. After all, if democracy means anything, it means that citizens not only have the right, they also bear the obligation to discuss and debate what the government should be doing. Absent that discussion and debate, much of the motivation for personal political activism is also lost. Those who have co-opted Mitchell’s argument for individual advocacy often quickly respond that nothing we do in a debate round can actually change government policy, and unfortunately, an entire generation of debaters has now swallowed this assertion as an article of faith. The best most will muster is, “Of course not, but you don’t either!” The assertion that nothing we do in debate has any impact on government policy is one that carries the potential to undermine Mitchell’s entire project. If there is nothing we can do in a debate round to change government policy, then we are left with precious little in the way of pro-social options for addressing problems we face. At best, we can pursue some Pilot-like hand washing that can purify us as individuals through quixotic activism but offer little to society as a whole. It is very important to note that Mitchell (1998b) tries carefully to limit and bound his notion of reflexive fiat by maintaining that because it “views fiat as a concrete course of action, it is bounded by the limits of pragmatism” (p. 20). Pursued properly, the debates that Mitchell would like to see are those in which the relative efficacy of concrete political strategies for pro-social change is debated. In a few noteworthy examples, this approach has been employed successfully, and I must say that I have thoroughly enjoyed judging and coaching those debates. The students in my program have learned to stretch their understanding of their role in the political process because of the experience. Therefore, those who say I am opposed to Mitchell’s goals here should take care at such a blanket assertion. However, contest debate teaches students to combine personal experience with the language of political power. Powerful personal narratives unconnected to political power are regularly co-opted by those who do learn the language of power. One need look no further than the annual state of the Union Address where personal story after personal story is used to support the political agenda of those in power. The so-called role-playing that public policy contest debates encourage promotes active learning of the vocabulary and levers of power in America. Imagining the ability to use our own arguments to influence government action is one of the great virtues of academic debate. Gerald Graff (2003) analyzed the decline of argumentation in academic discourse and found a source of student antipathy to public argument in an interesting place. I’m up against…their aversion to the role of public spokesperson that formal writing presupposes. It’s as if such students can’t imagine any rewards for being a public actor or even imagining themselves in such a role. This lack of interest in the public sphere may in turn reflect a loss of confidence in the possibility that the arguments we make in public will have an effect on the world. Today’s students’ lack of faith in the power of persuasion reflects the waning of the ideal of civic participation that led educators for centuries to place rhetorical and argumentative training at the center of the school and college curriculum. (Graff, 2003, p. 57) The power to imagine public advocacy that actually makes a difference is one of the great virtues of the traditional notion of fiat that critics deride as mere simulation. Simulation of success in the public realm is far more empowering to students than completely abandoning all notions of personal power in the face of governmental hegemony by teaching students that “nothing they can do in a contest debate can ever make any difference in public policy.” Contest debating is well suited to rewarding public activism if it stops accepting as an article of faith that personal agency is somehow undermined by the so-called role playing in debate. Debate is role-playing whether we imagine government action or imagine individual action. Imagining myself starting a socialist revolution in America is no less of a fantasy than imagining myself making a difference on Capitol Hill. Furthermore, both fantasies influenced my personal and political development virtually ensuring a life of active, pro-social, political participation. Neither fantasy reduced the likelihood that I would spend my life trying to make the difference I imagined. One fantasy actually does make a greater difference: the one that speaks the language of political power. The other fantasy disables action by making one a laughingstock to those who wield the language of power. Fantasy motivates and role-playing trains through visualization. Until we can imagine it, we cannot really do it. Role-playing without question teaches students to be comfortable with the language of power, and that language paves the way for genuine and effective political activism. Debates over the relative efficacy of political strategies for pro-social change must confront governmental power at some point. There is a fallacy in arguing that movements represent a better political strategy than voting and person-to-person advocacy. Sure, a full-scale movement would be better than the limited voice I have as a participating citizen going from door to door in a campaign, but so would full-scale government action. Unfortunately, the gap between my individual decision to pursue movement politics and the emergence of a full-scale movement is at least as great as the gap between my vote and democratic change. They both represent utopian fiat. Invocation of Mitchell to support utopian movement fiat is simply not supported by his work, and too often, such invocation discourages the concrete actions he argues for in favor of the personal rejectionism that under girds the political cynicism that is a fundamental cause of voter and participatory abstention in America today.

#### This outweighs your role of the ballot:

#### A) Scope—we make decisions constantly in every portion of our life but we almost never have the opportunity to create massive forms of social change

#### B) Controls the internal link—becoming good decision makers means we can become advocates and thinkers in the real world that challenge violence because we’re good at dealing with lots of situations.

### Reps Focus Bad

#### Excessive focus on discourse and representations kills the liberal movements you seek to promote by abstracting away from social change.

Chait 15 Jonathan Chait “How the language police are perverting liberalism.” NY Magazine January 275h 2015 <http://nymag.com/daily/intelligencer/2015/01/not-a-very-pc-thing-to-say.html> JW

Or maybe not. The p.c. style of politics has one serious, possibly fatal drawback: It is exhausting. Claims of victimhood that are useful within the left-wing subculture may alienate much of America. The movement’s dour puritanism can move people to outrage, but it may [and] prove ill suited to the hopeful mood required of mass politics. Nor does it bode well for the movement’s longevity that many of its allies are worn out. “It seems to me now that the public face of social liberalism has ceased to seem positive, joyful, human, and freeing,” confessed the progressive writer Freddie deBoer. “There are so many ways to step on a land mine now, so many terms that have become forbidden, so many attitudes that will get you cast out if you even appear to hold them. I’m far from alone in feeling that it’s typically not worth it to engage, given the risks.” Goldberg wrote recently about people “who feel emotionally savaged by their involvement in [online feminism] — not because of sexist trolls, but because of the slashing righteousness of other feminists.” Former Feministing editor Samhita Mukhopadhyay told her, “Everyone is so scared to speak right now.” That the new political correctness has bludgeoned even many of its own supporters into despondent silence is a triumph, but one of limited use. Politics in a democracy is still based on getting people to agree with you, not making them afraid to disagree. The historical record of political movements that sought to expand freedom for the oppressed by eliminating it for their enemies is dismal. The historical record of American liberalism, which has extended social freedoms to blacks, Jews, gays, and women, is glorious. And that glory rests in its confidence in the ultimate power of reason, not coercion, to triumph.

#### -Reps first focus is bad-making every piece of discourse a possible voter discourages argumentation about politically contentious issues because the cost of messing up is a loss. This causes less advocacies for marginalized groups because people will shy away from controversy and suggesting new ideas.

#### -Weigh the reps of the aff against the K—I’m the only one endorsing a positive action towards disadvantaged groups which is a reason why my discourse is valuable and the permutation is key. This is the most important form of reps because it suggests something good to do in the context of tradeoffs whereas your criticism is hyper-abstract.

### ROTB Modesty

#### Use modesty on the role of the ballot debate—it captures the benefits of multiple modes of debate and encourages clash.

Overing 15 Bob Overing (LD TOC finalist 2012) “Recovering the Role of the Ballot: Evaluative Modesty in Academic Debate” July 31st 2015, presented to the 2015 Alta Argumentation Conference JW

The first major advantage to modesty is that it balances the benefits of policy-based education and critical education derived from continental philosophy, critical race theory, rhetoric, etc. Proponents of both types of education make persuasive arguments for theories and practices that meet their ends (E.g. Strait & Wallace, 2008; Varda & Cook, 2012). Modesty maintains the advantages of both by forcing teams to engage on the assumption that both ROBs matter to the judge’s decision calculus. This prevents teams from talking past each other, which is surprisingly common. For instance, on this year’s college topic, an affirmative could defend legalization of marijuana by presenting the history of violent and racist drug criminalization but simultaneously argue that a disadvantage to legalization based on cartel violence is not germane to their role of the ballot. Or, a policy-based affirmative could argue that the epistemic problems in its representations of the international arena and its call for greater U.S. securitization are irrelevant to whether the plan is a good idea. Both examples of “framing” the debate are a means of hastily excluding discussion, and both are dominant strategies precisely because they enable the complete exclusion of the opposing team’s offense. Ryan Galloway (2007) extols the values of debate as a dialogical conversation, but nothing hampers dialogue more than a confident view of ROBs that allows teams to assert to their opponents, “You must only do X.” I believe that modesty excels at meeting Galloway’s vision for dialogue: Such an approach would have little use for rigid rules of logic or argument, such as stock issues…except to the point where the participants agreed that these were functional approaches. Instead, a dialogic approach encourages evaluations of affirmative cases relative to their performative benefits (p. 3). Indeed, modesty does away with rigid rules for the content of ROBs, embracing what Harrigan (2007) calls “argumentative pluralism” (p. 51-52). While Galloway and Harrigan use these values to motivate defenses of “the resolution as the bright line standard for evaluation” and switch-side debate, respectively, I find modesty a much better compromise. A modest judge can give weight to the effects of a plan while still considering “pre-fiat” problems of representation, ideology, epistemology, and the like. Rather than attempting to fit one set of arguments into another’s toolbox, modesty allows teams to do what they do best without excluding the opposition wholesale.

## homeless cards

### mortality salience

#### Mortality salience is an impetus for oppressive tendencies.

Solomon et al 3 (Sheldon, Prof. Psych. – Skidmore College, Jeff Greenberg, Prof. Psych. – U. Arizona, and Tom Pyszczynski, Prof. Psych. – Colorado U., Psychoanalytic Review, “Fear of Death and Human Destructiveness”, 90:457-474, (2003). Psychoanalytic Review, 90:457-474, Psychoanalytic Electronic Publishing)

The role of in-group identity in assuaging concerns about mortality has also been demonstrated in the domain of domestic race relations. Specifically, mortality salience leads white Americans to react sympathetically to a white racist (Greenberg, Schimel, Martens, Solomon, and Pyszcznyski, 2001) and to react negatively to an African American individual who violates the negative stereotype of African Americans-specifically, a studious chess-playing male African American college student (Schimel et al., 1999). These results support the notion that religious, political, and ethnic identities and beliefs serve a death-denying function, in that people respond to momentary reminders of death by increasing their affection for similar others and their disdain for dissimilar others. But earlier we argued that even in the absence of others who differ in these salient ways, people would designate others as a scapegoat to serve a terror-assuaging function. Harmon-Jones, Greenberg, Solomon, and Simon (1995) examined this notion empirically by assigning previously unacquainted people to different groups on the basis of their preference for abstract art works by Paul Klee or Wasily Kandinsky (the minimal group paradigm; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971). Participants then rated themselves and fellow in-group members and members of the other group after a mortality salience or control induction. Thinking about death resulted in exaggerated regard for one's own group and disparagement of those who preferred a different kind of art, despite the fact that the group had just been formed minutes ago, participants did not know anyone in their group directly, and membership in the group was based on a relatively unimportant preference for abstract art. One possible shortcoming of these findings is that they are all based on attitudinal measures. Thinking about death may engender more positive and negative attitudes toward similar and dissimilar others, respectively, but without leading people to behave accordingly. Additional research has, however, demonstrated the effects of mortality salience on actual behavior. After completing a mortality salience or control induction, Ochsmann and Mathy (1994) told German university students that the experiment was over and had them sit in a reception area, presumably to be paid for participating in the study. There was a row of chairs in the reception area, and in the center of the row was another student who was actually a confederate of the experimenters. The confederate appeared to be a German student for half of the participants; for the other half, the confederate appeared to be a Turkish student (currently a despised minority in Germany). The investigators were interested in how close to or far away from the confederate each participant would sit as a function of his appearance (German or Turkish) after thinking about death or a benign control topic. Although physical distance did not differ as a function of the confederate's appearance in the control condition, mortality salient participants sat closer to the fellow German and further away from the Turkish infidel. This finding establishes that mortality salience influences actual behavior above and beyond changes in attitudes. More recently, McGregor et al. (1998) demonstrated that subtle reminders of death produce actual physical aggression toward those who threaten deeply cherished beliefs. Liberal or conservative college students read an essay they believed was written by another student in the study that condemned either liberals or conservatives (e.g., “Liberals are the cause of so many problems in this country. … The bleeding heart stance they take, of trying to help everyone is a joke and incredibly stupid. How can they help the world when they can't even help themselves?” Or “Conservatives are the cause of so many problems in this country. … The cold-hearted stance they take, of trying to help only themselves is a joke and incredibly stupid. They are too busy thinking of themselves, and don't care about anyone else”). Then, after a mortality salience or control induction in what they believed to be a separate study, participants were given an opportunity to administer a quantity of their choosing of very hot salsa to the student who wrote the essay in the “first study,” and who claimed to dislike spicy foods. We used hot sauce administration as a direct measure of physical aggression because of some highly publicized incidents of hot sauce being used malevolently to harm others (e.g., police officers assaulted by a cook at Denny's; children being abused by being forced to drink hot sauce). Results indicated no differences in hot sauce allocation for similar and dissimilar others in the control condition; however, following mortality salience, participants administered twice the amount of hot sauce to different others than they did to similar others. Two additional studies replicated these effects. Reminders of death thus produced direct aggression toward those who challenge cherished aspects of cultural worldviews. The general finding that mortality salience produces world-view defense (i.e., exaggerated positive and negative responses to similar and dissimilar others, respectively) is thus quite robust and extends beyond attitudinal preferences to behavior and direct acts of physical aggression. Mortality salience effects have been independently obtained in labs in the United States, Canada, Germany, Israel, Italy, the Netherlands, and Australia, using a variety of mortality salience manipulations, including fear of death scales (instead of our typical open-ended questions) and films of gory automobile accidents. Mortality salience effects are also apparently unique to thoughts of death. Asking people to ponder unpleasant but nonlethal matters (e.g., failing an exam, giving a speech in public, being socially ostracized, being paralyzed, being in pain at the dentist) often results in self-reported anxiety and negative affect, but does not engender worldview defense (see Greenberg, Solomon, & Pyszczynski, 1997, for a review of this research). Additionally, mortality salience effects have been obtained in natural settings, such as when people are interviewed in front of a funeral parlor as opposed to 100 meters away from the funeral parlor (Pyszczynski, et al., 1996). Thus, subtle reminders of mortality are sufficient to arouse these effects. In fact, mortality salience effects do not even require a conscious confrontation with reminders of death at all! In three studies, Arndt, Greenberg, Pyszczynski, and Solomon (1997) found exaggerated reactions to pro- and anti-United States essay authors following subliminal reminders of death (specifically, 28 millisecond exposures to the word “death” vs. “field” or “pain”). This work, along with other findings (for a review, see Pyszczynski, Greenberg, and Solomon, 1999), has shown that worldview defense is intensified whenever death-related thought is on the fringes of consciousness (i.e., high in accessibility).

#### Their rhetoric of death inevitability leads to violence and bigotry.

Pyszczynski ‘**4** (Tom, Prof. Psych. – U. Colorado, Social Research, “What are we so afraid of? A terror management theory perspective on the politics of fear”, Winter, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_m2267/is\_4\_71/ai\_n13807478/)

2) Reminding people of the inevitability of death leads to a broad range of attempts to maintain faith in their worldviews and self-esteem and defend them against threats. These studies test the mortality salience hypothesis: if one's cultural worldview and self-esteem provide protection against the fear of death, then reminding people of the inevitability of death should increase their need to keep their worldviews and self-esteem strong. In the typical study, participants are reminded of death or another aversive topic that is not related to death (dental pain, failing an exam, giving a speech in front of a large audience, being socially excluded, being uncertain), and then exposed to people or ideas that either support or challenge their cultural worldviews. For example, in the first mortality salience study, Rosenblatt et al. (1989) had half of their sample of municipal court judges in Tucson, Arizona, fill out a questionnaire about death, and then all the judges read a case brief about a woman accused of prostitution and then set bail for her. Whereas control judges who were not reminded of their mortality set an average bond of $50, those who were first reminded of their mortality set an average bond of $455. Later studies have shown that such reminders of mortality can lead to increased prejudice, aggression toward those with different worldviews, estimates of social consensus for one's attitudes, anxiety when treating culturally valued objects in disrespectful ways, help for those within one's group, identification with valued aspects of self, affection for those who love us, and many other important psychological consequences (for more details, see Greenberg, Solomon, and Pyszczynski, 1997). What all these effects of mortality salience have in common is that they entail behavior that affirms or bolsters one's self-esteem or faith in one's worldview or behavior that diffuses any threats that might be impinging on these two components of one's shield against existential anxiety.